

**Glendale Community College
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee**

MINUTES

November 1, 2010 - 12:15 pm in AD121

Present: Ed Karpp, Jill Lewis, Karen Holden-Ferkich, Margaret Mansour, Mary Mirch, Alice Mecom, Ron Nakasone, Arnel Pascua, Rick Perez, John Queen, Ramona Barrio-Sotillo, Vicki Nicholson, Alfred Ramirez, Mike Scott, Hoover Zariani, Ana Boghazian, Monette Tiernan

Guests: Dawn Lindsay

Absent: Trudi Abram, Armond Aivazyan, Saodat Aziskhanova

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 12:17 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- MSC (Mirch/Holden-Ferkich) to accept the minutes of the October 25, 2010 meeting with corrections.

2. UPDATES

Mary related information regarding substantive change from the CCCCIO Conference she attended last week in San Diego. A condition of our accreditation “warning” status is that no substantive change proposals can be submitted until we are taken off warning. This means no new programs, degrees or certificates whether they exceed 50% offered online or not.

John related a conversation from the same conference and said that we don’t have to adopt the Chancellor’s Office transfer degrees approved by the CID system. We can respond without penalty and adopt the degrees that we want.

3. CONTINUED REVIEW OF DRAFT DOCUMENT

Organization of Document

Ed brought up the matter of how and who will handle the drafts and that we really need to move this activity along in order to meet our schedule. Dawn stated that we should not wait until January to take the follow-up report (draft) to the board and Mary was concerned that if the draft was not officially on the Agenda, but only available online that the board would be less likely to review it. It was agreed that we would make the draft available to the board via email prior to the Dec. 13th meeting. Any questions/concerns could be addressed at that meeting as part of the Accreditation Update Report. A formal 1st reading will be on the January 24th Agenda. Board members will have already had the opportunity to review the report on their own without having to log in through the college website. The 2nd reading and reading and approval can then be scheduled for the February 25th meeting so that the report can be delivered to the accrediting commission prior to the March 15, 2010 deadline. Jill will be the responsible for collecting rewrites and formatting the document. John will be the content editor and Monette will be responsible for final document editing.

Recommendation 2: SLOs

Alice reported that the SLO committee will meet later today and will be working on a progress plan for SLO Proficiency in fall 2012 as mandated by the ACCJC. She will have revisions to this recommendation based on the outcomes of the SLO meeting. Alice also explained that the SLO committee's goal is to make GCC "compliant" and that the committee could eventually become the "Assessing Success Committee". Mary related that based on discussions from the CCCCIO conference, the commission will be replacing SLO language with the term "continuous cycle of improvement". John reiterated conversations he had at the conference regarding more faculty issues with SLOs and compensation, particularly with adjunct faculty. The commission's response to this was that college's should "talk to their attorney's". Mary stated that we have put SLOs on course outlines and suggested keeping "continuous cycle of improvement" into our narrative.

John reminded the group that we must focus our report on what has happened since the writing of the self study document. Alice added that we must use our SLO numbers and the term "increasing" to meet our 2012 Proficiency Level in SLOs at the course, program and institutional levels. The SLO "pilot" groups are making progress using eLumen and will have a report for fall 2010. Program reviews due in December will also have updated SLO information. Mary would like for the eLumen "pilot" group to show the continuity of course-program-institutional SLOs to be reflected in the eLumen report. It was suggested that possibly Sarah McLemore could put together a report using English to demonstrate this. Alice brought up the difference in institutional outcomes. For many programs institutional outcomes are "core competencies", but for areas such as IT, an outcome that involves the entire campus and be called an "institutional outcome". Ed suggested that the core competency report be included with an explanation of its relationship to the EMP in our Annual Report. Different types of "outcomes" were discussed. Mary stressed the need for data driven information to feed into our planning processes and a preferred format such as goals in plans but perhaps not including outcomes and assessments. Alice will revise the "Resolution" section to reflect the changes discussed.

4. Program Review

Mary reported that the faculty personnel requests from program review have been forwarded to IHAC and SSHAC. The program review document will be evaluated by the Program Review Committee and the IPCC will evaluate the program review process. It was suggested that perhaps a BRIC guide could be used as a high-level checklist for this purpose. Mary noted the importance of having input by key groups who participated in program review.

Ed suggested that all IPCC members should review the entire draft on the IPCC website. Additionally, all writers should mark their changes from this point on so that we can all keep track.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Submitted by Jill Lewis